<u>REMARKS/ARGUMENTS</u>

In the final office action, claims 1, 4, 10, 31 and 33 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,539,421 to Appelman et al. (hereinafter Appelman) in view of U.S. 6,209,100 to Robertson et al. (hereinafter Robertson). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Appelman discloses a messaging application user interface which has an input element for receiving electronic messages and an output element for displaying electronic messages. The messaging application user interface can be implemented so as to maintain a subset of the plurality of potential message recipients, the subset being determined using a predetermined criterion (see abstract). As described at Col. 4, lines 35-37: "the input element 14 can be text field or a command line prompt in which the user enters a message 16 having an address 18 for whom he message 16 is intended. . .". It is submitted that messages in Appelman are not directed from a first client to a second unidentified client as claimed, but that all of the messages in Appelman are as clearly shown in Fig. 15 as address 634 and Fig. having address fields 644 and 652 (see Col. 9, lines 32 and 46-47). Much of Appelman discloses completing partial addresses that are entered in the input element of a user interface using a subset of potential message recipients (see Col. 6, line 8-Col. Col. 8, line 40).

Robertson discloses a method for moderating forums with anonymous but traceable contributions to the forum. An administrator is a person who sets up and maintains forums (see Col. 1, lines 13-14). A moderator is a subject-matter expert appointed to monitor the messages being posted to a particular(see Col. 1, lines 23-24). In Robertson, the identity of the forum contributor is hidden from readers of the anonymous contributor's messages, but at the same time, is known to the moderator(see Col. 2, lines 40-42). "A method for anonymously posting a message to a moderated forum, which can be moderated despite the anonymous contribution, is illustrated in FIG. 1" (see Col. 5, lines 24-26).

In claims 1, 6 and 10, methods for electronic instant message conversation are claimed in which a second unidentified client receives a first message to be published from a first client, the first message related to a topic of interest. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to make clear that the same message related to a topic of interest is published to subscribers of the topic of interest. Thus, at this point, all subscribers receive the same message. Claims 1, 6 and 10 have been

amended to make clear that the messages are filtered at the second client such that only messages of specific interest to the second client are received by the second client. This is set out at paragraph [0014], "Message filters are employed to allow listeners to only be alerted to messages that contain content of interest." Also, in paragraph "coworkers who have elected to see SkillTap Instant Messages containing keywords of interest to them are presented an alert box with the message." At paragraph [0038] "receiving a request message from a channel of a pub/sub server; Filtering the request message by a filtering application according to subscriber criteria." At paragraph [0055], "One of these applications, App 2 provides filtering techniques on incoming messages to eliminate messages that are not of interest to the client 2." Also at paragraph [0062] "The filter defines the user's areas of interest or expertise."

As claimed, the second subscriber being a subscriber to the service of the pub/sub service as being willing to receive messages related to the topic of interest and being anonymous to the first client and other subscribers of the pub/sub service. Thus, subscribers to the service themselves establish the messages to be received and further filter the received messages for message of specific interest to them, and not an administrator as in Robertson, or the first user as in Appelman. This is not shown in Appelman or Robertson. Claims 1, 6 and 10 also claim "creating at the second message . . . including further information pursuant to said specific interest included in said first message message;". Questions and answers are shown in Appelman, but those asking questions are always known to the answerer, and the answerer is always known to the questioner. In Robertson, a topic may be discussed which might include questions and answers, but the forum is established by an administrator, and not by subscribers who establish the topic and indicate a willingness to receive messages related to the topic, as claimed. It is submitted that claim 1, 6 and 10, and all claims depended therefrom, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Appelman in view of Robertson, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 5-9 claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Robertson and further in view of US 6,209,100 to Kapil et al. (hereinafter Kapil). The examiner cites Kapil for teaching the first message is received at the second client from the first client by way of a publish/subscribe server. However in Kapil,

the second client is known to the first client (see Col. 4, lines 17-19): "In this arrangement, user A on the terminal 12 may request a messaging or communications session with user B in the second community 16 . . .". (see also, Col. 4, lines 6-9). In Kapil, a communication session is established between a user A and user B before messages are sent (see Col. 4, line 34-49). As claimed, the first user publishes a message related to a topic of interest through a pub/sub service to unknown subscribers to are willing to receive messages related to the subject of interest. The messages to all of the subscribers are the same. However, each receiver of the message filters the message to find messages of specific interest to each subscriber. The unknown subscribers send a second message to the first user wherein the second message contains further information pursuant to said specific interest included in said first message. It is submitted that claims 2-3, 5-9, 30 and 32 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. over Appelman in view of Robertson and further in view of Kapil, which allowance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

<div align="center">RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED</div>

/Floyd A. Gonzalez/

FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney
Registration No. 26,732
Phone: 845-433-7282
Fax: 845-432-9786